G. R. S. 59] (Not to be destroyed)

GPB—3,000—20-7-12

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1912
S&A

(1H)

File No. 57—12

Land Rep
S&A 378/36 (1-2)

Serial Nos. 9 & 10

Papers Filed.

Month December 12

SUBJECT.

Informs the petitioner AKKayammanni that the order of April 12 should stand until there is a vacancy

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

S&A 255—11 Sl. 1 & 2
B. April 1912

LATER REFERENCES.

S&A 51—12 Sl. 13, 13a, 14
B April 1914
" 42-18 Sl. 1-B, B Aug 1919
C.J Dep 200-21

Correspondence 22.1.B.

G.R.S. 11] 1912

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(SM)

NOTES.

File No. 51/12

FILE HEADING.

Anekal Pallepar Family Pensions.

From

Mrs. Akkajammanni of Anekal Pallepar Family

No. Memorial Dated 9.8.12 Received 24.8.12

Diary No. 774	Enclos. 2 Spare Copies.	Serial No. 9

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays for the reconsideration of the orders passed in April 1912 regarding the devolution of the pension drawn by her and that her present representation may be given due consideration & equitable orders may be passed during her life time.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

G.O. V, IV, V & S. Submitted with previous references.

Nothing is known as to whether Hiriammanni the granddaughter of the memorialist has left any issues

The allegations against the adopted Son - Chickkarayappa II regarding the ill-treatment accorded to his wife Hiriammanni

See para 4 of the petition - She has no children

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—30,000—12-8-11

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S/A File No. 57 of 1912

Serial No.

5

Hiriammanni had to be investigated.
2 Kind attention is invited to the notes & orders contained in S/A File No 255-11 (Rs 102) put up herewith.
3 The memorial may be forwarded to the Khazana Bakshi for enquiry & report.
Submitted for orders.

MM-81 31.8.12 Mysore

Dewan's order on the memorial: Secretary. Please let this case be worked up.
(:) MR. 22/8/12

4 The petition is now under discussion & that in File 255 of 11-12 give the facts of the case.

5 The petitioner, was attempting to get an adoption recognised so that the pension might not lapse and the Govt were pleased to recognise this right and Govt. of 5th February 1889 was issued (Flag X) sanctioning her prayer.

6 It even went further & directed that on the demise of the petitioner the pension should devolve on Chikkarayappa the husband of petitioner's granddaughter. The petitioner and her granddaughter have now fallen out with Chikkaraya

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G.I.P.—65,000—17-6-12.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 57 of 191 2

Serial No.

and the order of 5.2.89 in so far as it relates to the devolution of the pension on Chickaraya is sought to be set aside. In P2. of file 255 of 11-12. the question as to the right of the petitioner to buy aside the claims of a duly recognised adopted son are discussed. There is also be. Sd that some force in the argument of the Petr that the only claim to the pension which Chickaraya has, is by marrying into the family and that he forfeits all such claim by deserting his wife.

If appears a report may be called for from the Kharane Bakshi regarding the allegations in the petition

Gilsenan 3/9/12. he

5 The petitioner prays for a reconsideration of the order passed by Govt in April last in which the case in former lines has question & revising the order of 1889 in regard to the devolution of pension

Flag A

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S&R File No. 51 of 1912 (4

Serial No.

Could be considered only when the pensionary allowance fell vacant.

2 The main grounds on which petr wants this G.O. set aside were order G 1883 directing the devolution of the pension to Chikkarayya II son her grandson (adopted son's son) Chikkarayya II after her death in that the person has abandoned his wife (the petitioner - daughter's daughter) in whose interest she had asked for the pension to be continued to him.

3 In para 20 of the petition, petr states that Chikkarayya II could have no independent claim to his pension + that whatever right he could assert it must be through his wife. This statement is not a correct statement: as Chikkarayya II can have claim to succeed to the pension not so much through his wife (petr's granddaughter) as through his father, who has been recognised by Govt to be his adopted son of the petr.

3363/9-9-12

Dewan

2/9
6/9/12.

Case is to be taken for consideration :- The order of April 12 should stand until there is a vacancy.

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Please put up on 2/9

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

SA File No. 51 of 1912

Serial No.

Draft endorsement Submtd

Mel-85 Bln.
13.XI.12 Secy)

13.XI.12

(Draft approved by the Secy)

Issued
6.XII.12

Ack & file

10

To Mrs Akkajammanni.

No 7C 3338 Dt 10.12.12.

Informs her that the order of April should stand until there is a vacancy.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

To

T. Ananda Rao Esqr., C.I.E.,

Dewan of Mysore,

Bangalore.

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Date of Receipt 22/8/12
Stamps: Rs. Two.
Petn. Regr. No. 4634

ENTRY No. 7
1912 / 13
SECTION STA
FILE No. 51-12
SERIAL No. 9

Most Respected Sir,

The humble memorial of Akkajammanni most respectfully shewth:-

1. That the memorialist is the surviving eldest member of the Anekal Palyepat family.

2. That she solicits permission to approach your Excellency in the matter of her memorial to your Exeellency, dated 25th October 1911, regarding the devolution of the Pension of Rs. 222-6-0, now graciously allowed to her as a member of the said Anekal Palyegar family, and in regard to which the Government were pleased to direct that the question can only be considered when the Pensionary allowance falls vacant.

3. That the memorialist refrains from troubling your Excellency with a reiteration of all the facts connected with her case as brought to your notice in the memorial of October 1911, as they were all before your Excellency when her first memorial was submitted.

4. That briefly the said Anekal Palyegar family to which your humble memorialist belongs, is an old historical and powerful one, the members of which in the past had their dominions over very large area and who were the staunch allies of the British Government and rendered good service under the Great General Harris in the British Cause. It was on these and other considerations that His Highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wodayar Bahadur was pleased to extend his munificence to this family and continue the very liberal pension which to this day is being enjoyed by your memorialist.

5. The family which in days past comprised a large number of persons has gradually narrowed itself into but two female members consisting of the memorialist (Akkajammanni) and her grand daughter (Hiriammannai). For ready reference the memorialist's connection with the main line is given in the appended geneological table.

6. In the early days of your memorialist's life, i.e. in about the year 1861, your memorialist tried to take in adoption one Chikkarayaru No.1, with the object of marrying her daughter Maligammannai to him and thereby continuing the family line and retaining the Pension through such line, within the family circle, but this prayer was refused.

7. That in about 1877 Hiriammannai your memorialist's grand-daughter (daughter of Maligammannai above referred to) was born and your memorialist took her under her sole protection, brought her up as her own child, and with the object mainly of securing and continuing the pension in the line through her after your memorialist's demise, arranged to take in adoption Chikkarayaru No.II (the eldest son of Chikkarayaru No.I whose adoption was first refused) and marry your memorialist's grand-daughter Hiriammannai to him, thus interposing a male member and not only continuing the line but also the pension through him to the benefit of the said grand daughter Hiriammannai, in accordance with the spirit of the generous intention of Government as regards the succession to such Palyepat pensions.

8. That your memorialist's representations to the then Dewan, the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer K.C.S.I., underwent a very elaborate enquiry through the Khazana Bakshi and finally the Dewan in order dated February 1889 recognized the adoption and directed that after your memorialist's death the pension should descend to the said adopted son Chikkarayaru No.II, whom it was proposed to marry to your memorialist's

daughter's daughter (Hiriammanna).

9. That accordingly Hiriammannai was married to Chikkarayaru No.II a few years later, and both husband and wife continued to remain under your memorialist's support and protection for some time.

10. That for some reason or other the said Chikkarayaru No.II suddenly left memorialist's protection, subjected his wife to all sorts of ill-treatment, persecution and outrage, forsook her altogether and took to another wife by whom, your memorialist learns, he has at present three childron.

11. That the relationship between Hiriammanni and her husband thus became strained and to add to this Hiriammanni has also no offspring of her own; and the sudden change of events in her career thus unexpectedly brought about, has upset all your memorialist's cherished hopes and expectation and made her anxious about her unfortunate grand-daughter's future.

12. To what extent the relationship between the husband and the wife (Chikkarayaru II and Hiriammanni) has become estranged and irreconcilable, will be apparent from a kind perusal, among others, of the copies of the two papers sent herewith. The first of which a judgment of the District Magistrate of Salem, will show how the husband mercilessly tried to carry away by assault and criminal force, his wife while under her mother's roof and how he (the husband) was fined Rs.20 therefor. The second which is an order of the Judges of the Hon'ble Chief Court of Mysore will show how the efforts of Chikkarayaru II to get an order directing his wife to live with him proved futile and how the Hon'ble Chief Court permitted Hiriammanni (the wife) to remain with her mother in consequance

1. Copy of judgment in Criminal case No.3 of 1897 on the file of the District Magistrate of Salem.

2. Copy of order in revision petition case No.145 of 1897 on the file of the Chief Court of Mysore, Bangalore.

of the husband's ill-treatment and wrongful confinement. Such, Your Excellency, are the notable features of the relationship between husband and wife which, it is impracticable to retrieve at this distance of time. To add to your memorialist's anxieties, the said Chikkarayaru No.II has, she learns, been endeavouring to set up his own right to the pension now enjoyed by her, presumably taking advantage of the letter and language of the orders passed in February 1889 which said that after memorialist's death, the pension will descend to her adopted son Chikkarayaru.

13. That Hiriammanni the memorialist's grand daughter is, on the other hand, still in her prime of life with perhaps many more years to live and struggle through. Besides your memorialist, she has no one to depend upon. If therefore Chikkarayaru No.II succeeds your memorialist after her demise, as apparently he is trying to do, the said Hiriammanni will be denied a comfortable competence for her life and will have to remain homeless and penniless, reduced to the utmost poverty.

14. That it was considerations like these that compelled your memorialist to approach Your Excellency last year with a brief representation of the change of events that had taken place in the family subsequent to the passing of the order of 1889 and to implore for a more merciful and generous view of the matter so that, after her, the pension may go to her granddaughter at least for the rest of her life and that she be thereby placed above all need and want and continue to keep up the prestige and dignity of the great family to which she has the honour to belong.

15. That to your memorilaist's misfortune, her original prayer was not given a hearing and the same was deferred for consideration till after the pension actually fell vacant-vide Endorsement No.F14227 S.&A.255-11-2, dated 8th April 1912.

16. That your memorialist does not know if all the pitiable circumstances of her and her grand daughter's unfortunate case were before Government or not, at the time of the passing of the said order of April 1912 and she has therefore ventured, in the interests of her only grand daughter and the only scion of this ancient Pallepat to thus approach Your Excellency once again on the subject.

17. That your memorialist is past 77 years of age and may pass away any moment.

18. That it is her earnest ambition that during her life time something should, if practicable, be done for her grand daughter or that she should at least be given an assurance that her prayers concerning her would receive a favourable consideration later on, and that her grand-daughter would not be neglected or left uncared for. It is also her desire that the past good name of the family should be kept up, that her grand-daughter should not be made to cast herself on the tender mercies and caprices of Chikkarayaru II, or others, and that, what is more important, her life long aim of keeping the pension within the family circle, should to some extent, be assured.

19. That on the other hand by postponing the consideration of the question till after your memorialist's death, many frivolous demands and unnecessary complications are sure to crop up and your memorialist will be shut out of all opportunities of having her say.

20. That it is worthy of consideration whether Chikkarayaru II could have any sort of independent claim for the pension in question. In fact whatever right he may assert must emanate purely and entirely through his legally married wife, Hiriammannai your memorialist's grand daughter and it is a matter for consideration whether by his inequitable and unreasonable action in forsaking and deserting his lawfully wedded wife and thereby injuring the good name of the

the family, he has not forfeited his claim, if any, to such a pension, nor would it be legal or equitable to confer the pension upon the son of a strange woman as Chikkarayaru's second wife is. By any recognition or countenance of such a stranger, the long cherished object of keeping the pension within the main line will certainly become frustrated and the line will be completely extinct and all reminiscences of the family history will for ever be lost and forgotten.

21. That these are some of the considerations which your memorialist would like to place before Your Excellency for further generous consideration. In so doing she most humbly prays that her present representations may be given due consideration in her life time only and that she be afforded an opportunity of being heard and that such orders as Your Excellency may appear equitable in the unfortunate circumstances of her case now specifically brought to Your Excellency's notice, may be passed during her life time, so that her few remaining days of life, may be spent in peace of mind and that she may die with the consolation that her grand daughter has had the support and help of the benign Government.

For which act of charity and kindness your memorialist will for ever be indebtted.



7

Before the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore

IN THE COURT OF THE

BANGALORE.

Petn NO. _____ OF 1912-12

Petitioner - A K Rajeshwara Iyengar
Plaintiff. Defendant.

Versus C/o L. Sreenivasiengar
Advocate. Bangalore

I A K Rajeshwara Iyengar the above named Petitioner
by these presents retain Messrs. L. SREENIVASIENGAR and V. VENKATACHAR Advocates for and in my name to conduct the aforesaid case.

I Further empower my said Advocates to execute any decree that may be passed in my favour, and to recover and receive all and every sum and sums of money, or other property, and to grant sufficient for the same.

And I undertake to ratify and confirm all legal acts done or caused to be done by my said Advocates in the case by virtue of these presents. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 15th day of August 1912.

ಎ ಕೆ ರಾಜೇಶ್ವರ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ಯರವರದಿಯವು

Accepted.

ವಿ ವೆಂಕಟಾಚಾರ್

ಎಂ ಕಟ್ಟಿನ ನಾಯಕ್ಕ *Advocates.*

Accepted
L Sreenivasiengar
In petn 7 of 12

Signed before me.
Ramiah
Village Munsiff Konanakunte
9-7-912.

G.R.S. 26]

7/12/-

File No. 51/12

Serial No. 10

Diary No. of letter replied to 774

No. H 3338

& 10-12-12

General and Revenue Secretariat

(SM)

, *the* 19 .

To

Mrs: Akkajammanni,
Anekal Pallegar Family Pensioner,
c/o. Mr: L. Srinivasiengar
Advocate,
Bangalore City.

Date of issue 10-12-12

Signed by W L Narasimhaiah

In reply to her memorial dy 9.8.12 presented to the Dewan of Mysore, praying for reconsideration of the order passed in H. No 4227/SM.255 dy 8.6.12 regarding the devolution of the Pallegar Pension drawn by her,

over. The

SUBJECT.

The petitioner is informed that the case is not yet mature for reconsideration and that the order communicated in April 1912 should stand until there is a vacancy.

2. The enclosures received with the memorial are returned herewith.

By order,

Dy: Secretary 6/12

13.XI.12

Mul-85 pbk
13.XI.12

List of enclosures,

Copied by KB 9/12/12

Examined by

GPE—20,000—25-9-10